1 2 3 4	David B. Rosenbaum, AZ Bar No. 009819 Eric M. Fraser, AZ Bar No. 027241 OSBORN MALEDON, P.A. 2929 N. Central Ave., Suite 2100 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793 (602) 640-9000 drosenbaum@omlaw.com efraser@omlaw.com	Geo Jaco jam BR' Two Pho	orge C. Chen, 019704 orge.chen@bryancave.com ob A. Maskovich, 021920 askovich@bryancave.com YAN CAVE LLP, 00145700 o N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100 enix, AZ 85004-4406 (602) 364-7000 / Fax: (602) 364-7070	
5 6 7 8 9	Jack W. Londen, AZ Bar No. 006053 (Pro Hac Vice) MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, California 94105-2482 (415) 268-7000 JLonden@mofo.com	Jam WII AN 350 Los	tes M. Dowd (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) tes.Dowd@wilmerhale.com LMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE D DORR LLP South Grand Avenue, Suite 2100 Angeles, CA 90071 (213) 443-5300 / Fax: (213) 443-5400	
10 11 12	J. Alexander Lawrence (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 250 W 55th St. New York, NY 10019 (212) 468-8000 ALawrence@mofo.com	Atto	orneys for Respondent ASML US, Inc.	
13	Attorneys for Petitioner Nikon Corporation			
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
15	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA			
16 17	In re: Application Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1782 of Nikon Corporation,		Case No.: 2:17-mc-00035-JJT	
18	Petitioner,		JOINT PROPOSED DOCUMENT PRODUCTION SCHEDULE	
19	- To take discovery of -			
20	ASML US, Inc.,			
	D 1			
21	Respondent.			
	The parties hereby submit this joint p	ropos	ed Document Production Schedule,	
22				
21222324	The parties hereby submit this joint p	12, 20	017 ("Order", Dkt. No. 25). The parties	
22 23	The parties hereby submit this joint p pursuant to the Court's Order of September	12, 20	017 ("Order", Dkt. No. 25). The parties	
22 23 24	The parties hereby submit this joint p pursuant to the Court's Order of September are unable to agree on a production schedule	12, 20	017 ("Order", Dkt. No. 25). The parties	
22 23 24 25	The parties hereby submit this joint p pursuant to the Court's Order of September are unable to agree on a production schedule below:	12, 20 e and	O17 ("Order", Dkt. No. 25). The parties thus state their respective positions	

January 2018 (*i.e.*, January 12 and 17). Thus, it is Nikon's position that the production should be commenced within forty-five days of the date of the Court's September 12, 2017 Order granting Nikon's Application (*i.e.*, October 27, 2017), with full completion of the production within thirty-five days thereafter (*i.e.*, December 1, 2017). That production schedule will permit Nikon time to review the material produced and address any questions with ASML US about the adequacy of the production prior to the January 2018 evidentiary deadlines.

As recognized by Magistrate Judge Van Keulen in *Nikon Corp. v. GlobalFoundries U.S. Inc.*, No. 17-mc-80071-SVK, Dkt. No. 24 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2017), any production schedule by which ASML US seeks to identify and stage productions based on its view of the relevance to particular foreign proceedings will only result in unnecessary disputes. *See id.* (Aug. 15, 2017 Tr.) at 38 ("Returning to Global Foundries' proposed conditions in its brief. One was that it wanted to structure a response to tie it to the timing of the actions. I believe it referred specifically to the Netherlands, and I think that that would only encourage further argument over which documents are teed up first, second, and third and so forth. So I think that the parties should proceed in terms of negotiating the scope of production, start a rolling production, and move along and produce the documents in a timely fashion. I would suggest that this production would appear to be able to be completed in 45 days.")

II. ASML US'S POSITION

ASML US has proposed to Nikon that it will serve Nikon with written objections by October 6, will meet and confer regarding those objections by October 13, will make its first production of responsive documents to Nikon by November 10, and will continue making productions on a rolling basis thereafter. Furthermore, to help alleviate Nikon's concerns about pending deadlines in the underlying proceedings, ASML US has offered to work with Nikon to identify those requests that pertain to those foreign actions in which Nikon has its earliest filing deadlines, and focus its collection and review accordingly.

Nikon has rejected ASML US's proposal and cites to the proceedings it has filed

1	against GlobalFoundries as supporting its position. However, that comparison is			
2	misleading, as Nikon argued to the Northern District of California that it "has propounded			
3	significantly more limited requests [against GlobalFoundries] than against ASML US."			
4	Nikon Corp. v. GlobalFoundries U.S. Inc., No. 17-mc-80071-SVK, Dkt. No. 36 (N.D.			
5	Cal. Sept. 11, 2017), at *23. In addition, while Nikon cites the Magistrate Judge's			
6	comment during oral argument, today the district court granted GlobalFoundries's reques			
7	for an Interim stay, while addressing the same deadlines that Nikon cites here.			
8	Specifically, Judge Freeman stated: "Nikon asserts that any delay in production would			
9	jeopardize its ability to meet January 2018 deadlines in the Netherlands and Germany.			
10	While the Court is sympathetic to Nikon's obligations in other fora, Nikon is the entity			
11	seeking to impose its legal disputes on a third party who wants no part of them." Id., Dkt			
12	46 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 22, 2017), at *5.			
13	As ASML US has previously indicated, personnel at ASML US do not have the			
14	subject matter expertise to locate and identify materials potentially responsive to Nikon's			
15	requests. It is therefore anticipated that it will be necessary for employees of ASML NV			
16	in the Netherlands to identify any responsive documents, making Nikon's proposed			
17	document schedule impracticable.			
18				
19	JOINTLY SUBMITTED this 22 nd day of September, 2017.			
20	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP			
21	By: <u>/s/ J. Alexander Lawrence</u> J. ALEXANDER LAWRENCE			
22				
23	Attorneys for Petitioner Nikon Corporation			
24	WILMED CLITLED DICKEDING HALE AND			
25	WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP			
26	By: <u>/s/ Gregory H. Lantier (with permission)</u> GREGORY H. LANTIER			
27	Attorneys for Respondent ASML US, Inc.			
28				

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that on September 22, 2017, the attached document was electronically transmitted to the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System which will send notification of such filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to all CM/ECF registrants. /s/ Robin Sexton